



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/620,538

07/15/2003

Brian G. Payton

SVL920020046US1

8432

24852

7590

06/26/2006

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORP

IP LAW

555 BAILEY AVENUE, J46/G4

SAN JOSE, CA 95141

EXAMINER

VAUTROT, DENNIS L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/620,538	Applicant(s) PAYTON ET AL.	
	Examiner Dennis L. Vautrot	Art Unit 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/20/04 & 4/24/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 24 April 2006 and 20 February 2004 have been received and entered into the record. Since the IDS comply with the provisions of MPEP § 609, the references cited therein have been considered by the examiner. See attached form PTO-1449.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kusterer et al.** (2005/0076311) in view of **Mancinelli** (US 2003/0195880).

3. Regarding claim 1, **Kusterer et al.** (hereinafter **Kusterer**) teaches the model content provider comprising: a plurality of API-specific content viewers communicating with corresponding ones of the running applications (See page 5, paragraph [0045] "The navigation service 420 provides an abstraction level between the data level and visualization level... The abstraction level defines interfaces... for the navigation data

Art Unit: 2167

provided to the iViews and the navigation connectors used to connect with different applications.” The navigation connectors change for the different specific applications that are being connected to. Also, see page 16, paragraph [0050] “Connectors can be implemented for new applications, which can be plugged into a portal system.”);

and a reusable, API-independent content viewer communicating with the API-specific content viewers and the query model (See page 17, paragraph [0052] “One or more related iViews 416 can also be provided to display standardized object linking relationships.” Regardless of the application, this iView provides for displaying the standardized “independent” object linking relationships.)

Kusterer fails to teach a model content provider for receiving queries from a user interface portion having a plurality of GUI API's running applications, and for providing elements of the query to a query model.

However **Mancinelli** teaches a model content provider for receiving queries from a user interface portion having a plurality of GUI API's running applications, and for providing elements of the query to a query model (See page 4, paragraph [0039]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of **Kusterer** with that of **Mancinelli** because adding a GUI interface to an SQL database makes it easier for the user to develop the queries and the data can be derived from a

variety of different forms, but still appear seamlessly integrated to the user. Also, **Kusterer** suggests on page 4, paragraph [0042] that the portal platform can include a “database repository [that] can include an SQL Database and a Portal Content Directory.”) It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include a model content provider for receiving queries from a user interface portion having a plurality of GUI API's running applications, and for providing elements of the query to a query model.

4. Regarding claims 2, 5, and 8, **Kusterer** additionally teaches the API-independent content viewer further comprises a generalized set of classes (See page 1, paragraph [0009] “The portal system also includes navigation connectors that operate with the different application sources to provide the navigation information from the data level to the navigation service module.” According to the specification of the instant application on page 5, lines 15-17, the common set of generalized classes is “provided between the user interface and the query model for use in retrieving data from the query model and populating user interfaces of different formats. This is the same concept of what is occurring in **Kusterer** with the navigation connectors.)

5. Regarding claims 3, 6, and 9, **Kusterer** additionally teaches the content viewers further comprise a hierarchical set of classes, the API-independent classes comprising the top of the hierarchy (See page 17, paragraph [0052] “Some standard navigation iViews can be supplied. A Top Level Navigation (TLN) iView 412 can display the

highest level or levels of a user's hierarchical navigation structure." This relates to the independent classes.) and GUI-specific classes content viewers structures comprising the bottom of the hierarchy (See page 3, paragraph [0034] "The navigation model architecture can be implemented in a portal-based network environment and can provide customers with a customizable navigation model, where a customer can create Portals with different navigation themselves (e.g., navigation hierarchies that build on the united navigation hierarchy from different applications).")

6. Regarding claim 4, **Kusterer** teaches the steps of communicating with corresponding ones of the running applications using a plurality of API-specific content viewers (See page 5, paragraph [0045] "The navigation service 420 provides an abstraction level between the data level and visualization level... The abstraction level defines interfaces... for the navigation data provided to the iViews and the navigation connectors used to connect with different applications." The navigation connectors change for the different specific applications that are being connected to. Also, see page 16, paragraph [0050] "Connectors can be implemented for new applications, which can be plugged into a portal system.");

and communicating with the API-specific content viewers and the query model using a reusable, API-independent content viewer (See page 17, paragraph [0052] "One or more related iViews 416 can also be provided to display standardized object linking

Art Unit: 2167

relationships.” Regardless of the application, this iView provides for displaying the standardized “independent” object linking relationships.)

Kusterer fails to teach a method for receiving queries from a user interface having a plurality of GUI API's running applications, and for providing elements of the query to a query model.

However **Mancinelli** teaches a method for receiving queries from a user interface having a plurality of GUI API's running applications, and for providing elements of the query to a query model (See page 4, paragraph [0039]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of **Kusterer** with that of **Mancinelli** because adding a GUI interface to an SQL database makes it easier for the user to develop the queries and the data can be derived from a variety of different forms, but still appear seamlessly integrated to the user. Also, **Kusterer** suggests on page 4, paragraph [0042] that the portal platform can include a “database repository [that] can include an SQL Database and a Portal Content Directory.”) It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include a model content provider for receiving queries from a user interface portion having a plurality of GUI API's running applications, and for providing elements of the query to a query model.

7. Regarding claim 7, **Kusterer et al.** teaches an article of manufacture comprising a computer program carrier readable by a computer and embodying one or more instructions executable by the computer (See page 18, paragraph [0063]) with the computer program comprising: program instructions for communicating with corresponding ones of the running applications using a plurality of API-specific content viewers (See page 5, paragraph [0045] “The navigation service 420 provides an abstraction level between the data level and visualization level... The abstraction level defines interfaces...for the navigation data provided to the iViews and the navigation connectors used to connect with different applications.” The navigation connectors change for the different specific applications that are being connected to. Also, see page 16, paragraph [0050] “Connectors can be implemented for new applications, which can be plugged into a portal system.”);

and program instructions for communicating with the API-specific content viewers and the query model using a reusable, API-independent content viewer (See page 17, paragraph [0052] “One or more related iViews 416 can also be provided to display standardized object linking relationships.” Regardless of the application, this iView provides for displaying the standardized “independent” object linking relationships.)

Kusterer fails to teach a model content provider for receiving queries from a user interface portion having a plurality of GUI API's running applications, and for providing elements of the query to a query model.

However **Mancinelli** teaches an article of manufacture for receiving queries from a user interface portion having a plurality of GUI API's running applications, and for providing elements of the query to a query model (See page 4, paragraph [0039]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of **Kusterer** with that of **Mancinelli** because adding a GUI interface to an SQL database makes it easier for the user to develop the queries and the data can be derived from a variety of different forms, but still appear seamlessly integrated to the user. Also, **Kusterer** suggests on page 4, paragraph [0042] that the portal platform can include a "database repository [that] can include an SQL Database and a Portal Content Directory.") It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include an article of manufacture for receiving queries from a user interface portion having a plurality of GUI API's running applications, and for providing elements of the query to a query model.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Prompt et al. (US 2001/0034733) discloses a hierarchical/relational translation system.


Tung Ng et al. (US 6,279,008) discloses an integrated graphical user interface method and apparatus for mapping between objects and databases.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis L. Vautrot whose telephone number is 571-272-2184. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dv
16 June 2006


JOHN R. COTTINGHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER


20 June 2006